**Missoula County Public Schools**

**Title I Standing Committee**

**Meeting Notes**

Monday, January 14, 2013

6:00 to 7:30 PM

Administration Building, Room 24

**Attendees:** Tara Barba, Brian Bessette, Heather Davis Schmidt, Lori Grant, Terry Jarvis, Sindie Kennedy, Kelly Kopitzke, Tracy Ledyard, Matt Quinlan, Erica Ramsey, Julie Robitaille, Joy Seymour.

**Guiding Question:**

How do we assure the MCPS Title I program best meets the needs of students and families?

**Long term target:**

Develop a shared and deep understanding of Title I programming as related to the Title I and district goals, and the *MCPS 21st Century Model of Education*.

* Build background knowledge in the Title I programming related to:
  + Schoolwide Title I programming
  + Targeted Title I programming
  + Parent/Teacher Home Visit Project
  + Title I Summer School
  + Professional development
  + Technology integration
  + Supplemental Educational Services (SES)
* Revise Title I goals to align with the district goals and the *MCPS 21st Century Model of Education*
  + Review building plans to assure they are in alignment with Title I and district goals and the [21st Century Model of Education](http://www.mcps.k12.mt.us/portal/Home/21stCenturySchoolsInitiative/21stcenturyplan/tabid/3353/Default.aspx).
* Develop the 2013-14 budget
  + Consider other strategies that could best utilize funding while accelerating programming

**Short term targets:**

* Review collective commitments for collaborative work (Affinity Protocol)
* Revise and finalize 2013-14 Title I goals
* Revise and finalize 2013-14 Title I budget

**AGENDA**

|  |
| --- |
| Welcome, dinner, video of Manny Scott, review agenda |
| Review collective commitments for collaborative work ([Affinity Protocol](http://www.nsrfharmony.org/protocol/doc/affinity_mapping.pdf)) |
| Recap last meeting   * All handouts from previous meetings will be available on the Wiki. Sindie will share the link with everyone. |
| Elements of 21st Century Education and Title I (emphasizing Student Engagement element). (View video from TedEx MCPS event – Nick Sheppard on Flipping the Classroom.)  Guiding questions:   * How might students’ sense of self, community, belonging, and purpose increase their level of participation directed toward learning and be reflected in their overall performance? * How might opportunities to research and study authentic issues shape students’ motivation and commitment to learning?   Goal:   * Educators in every school will connect learning to the real world through authentic and innovative experiences to increase student engagement, motivation, and investment in their learning. |
| Review Title I Programming:  We always use February Free & Reduced Lunch numbers from the current school year to determine the budget allocations for the following school year.  Title I funding is prioritized for those schools that have the most significant percentage of students eligible for Free & Reduced Lunch, which is an indicator of poverty. Seeley Lake is the high school with the highest level of poverty. Typically, Hellgate and Big Sky are equal. Elementary schools that have received targeted Title I support in the past have not maintained consistent Free & Reduced numbers. One year they are eligible; the next year, they are not. Right now, these schools don't meet the district K-5 average. Typically, the average decreases as the grades increase. High school drops. The percentages change every month. January averages are: Grades K-8: 46.1; Grades 6-8: 42%; High School: 32%. Buildings are funded on a per pupil basis. Population at the high schools can vary a lot. Seeley's overall budget doesn't have a big impact on the overall Title I budget. Big Sky and Seeley will definitely exceed the district average to be eligible for Title I funding. Hellgate will likely maintain their Title I status; however, if Big Sky’s numbers remain high and Hellgate’s number do not increase, Hellgate’s Title I funding could be affected.  Questions:   * Should we fund all of the schools that meet the district average or just those with the highest need? * Do we prioritize the school with the highest level of poverty or do we spread it out to serve more schools? * What other programming should we be doing?   There are services that are available only to Free & Reduced Lunch applicants such as ACT/ SAT fee waivers and Supplemental Education Services (SES). Summer school is provided for targeted students - the determination is based on the need for credit recovery. We don't have to deliver our Title I interventions the same way in every building.   * Is there anything we should be doing differently?   A committee member asked if the loss of Title I funding affected achievement in those schools that once received targeted support? The committee would like to see achievement data from Lewis & Clark that shows achievement with and without Title I support. Heather explained former Title I buildings use RTI to address achievement variances. Walk to Read and Walk to Math are other programs that are used. There are variables at each building, outside of Title I that could impact achievement scores. For instance, there is a significant difference between situational poverty and generational poverty. Students at Paxson and Lewis & Clark tend to be students that live in the university housing, which is a different type of poverty (more situational poverty).  Some staff at Lewis & Clark have indicated they prefer not having Title I funding because they have more consistency and sustainability. Do we provide professional development to prepare teachers to provide instruction without Title I funding?  Credit Recovery - Julie has been thinking about transition. She is thinking about a bridge in math summer program for entering 9th graders to be offered at Hellgate and Big Sky. We would have to serve only targeted students. Math is in the process of being revamped because of Common Core.  The committee felt there is lot of support for student through elementary and middle school. We need to provide that same level of support at the high school level. Whatever we are doing at the K-8 level to support struggling students should be done at the high school level. Heather explained the plan is to give students extra time on a subject by giving them a pre-teaching class. For instance, Title I students who is taking Algebra I will also take a separate class where the algebra content is pre-taught. She explained we need to keep expectations high for all kids. We need to push the kids at the K-8 levels to better prepare them for high school.  Heather explained we need strongest teachers teaching the kids that are struggling. We have to push the students to master the content. If we have the expectations, we have to set them up. It is not just a Title issue and not just a high school issue.  All Title I elementary schools offer after-school programming. The programming looks different in each building. Joy suggested focusing after-school programming more on applied math and science with an emphasis on fun (e.g., chess club).  Lowell uses SuccessMaker and has used it for after school. It is used mostly for reading with a little bit of math. Sindie will follow-up on SuccessMaker to assure we have our district-wide server in line for installation. Julie is considering adding SuccessMaker to her programming.  Using the iPads in the buildings has been a very positive thing. The audio capacity is very important in helping students at home. |
| Review Title I Goals  Questions:   * Is there anything missing   We did not have time to address the goals. |
| Meeting of Practitioners – Scheduled for March 22   * Purpose – The annual meeting is required as a condition of Title I funding. The purpose of the meeting is to review next year’s budget, to review Title I funding guidelines and to begin planning for next year. * Who attends – Building principal, Title I teachers, FRC coordinator and a parent. |
| Closing and next steps  ***TO REVIEW FOR NEXT MEETING:*** [*Building Plan Template*](https://www.dropbox.com/s/clt7kjtnsbcwhmf/Building%20Plan%20Template.docx)  [Exit Ticket (Head, Heart, Hand Protocol)](https://www.dropbox.com/s/y8h4ku9hzhizexp/Jan%2014%20Title%20I%20Standing%20Committee%20ExitTicket_HeadHeartHandProtocol.doc) |

Next meeting date: Wednesday, March 20, 2013

**Exit Ticket**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Head:** When considering the 21st Century Model of Change, how might Title I programming look different (e.g., what would you like to see offered through Title I)? . . . | **Heart:** One thing I am feeling right now . . . | **Hand:** One thing I will do as a result of our work and conversation . . . |
| More practical application of math and science in after school programs (make math fun). | Feeling that so much is preset, that it is hard to make a change. And, wondering how much the current programs are working and if they are being utilized to their full potential. | Not sure. |
| Curriculum and instruction in Title classes. | Dedication to Title I programming at Hellgate. | Continue to research curriculum and instruction practices for Title classes. |
| I like the after school fun math club. | It is a hard decision to decide on funding. One doesn’t want to hinder a student by not providing Title funding. | Talk to parents and students to find out their ideas. |
| More programming in high school to continue to support students who struggle in math and reading, but also other subject areas like social studies and English. | . . . is listened to, and respected for my point of view. | Continue to advocate for students and their learning. |
| Not sure right now. | That the district has a lot going on. With funding always changing how do we have the opportunity to really focus on and implement programs? | Talk to principal about our Title programs and how they are working. |
| Teacher education – how to make differentiation work. | More a part of the whole – in other words, many other people have the same concerns I do. | Share with others who have questions and concerns. |
| Different structures – Title teachers team/co-teach in the classroom (idea?). Are there different structures for elementary/middle school/high school to support students academically? | Agree with 8th-9th grade math/reading bridge program and prioritizing Title assistance. | Support RTI teams in creating plans and strategies for meeting all students’ needs. |
| Innovative approaches to applied literacy and applied math including technology. | We need to envision a comprehensive model of interventions across the district then go above and beyond with Title. | Get more info/ideas from Joy for afterschool programs. |
| I like that individual schools still create their own Title plans. | Relieved the consensus seemed to be to continue to prioritize funding. | Continue to stay open to new ideas. |